

THE
Orthodox Trinitarian :

OR AN

Explication and Assertion of the

DOCTRINE

OF THE

Holy Trinity & Unity.

According to Scripture,

AND THE

Late ACT of PARLIAMENT.

By a lover of Truth and Peace.

L O N D O N,

Printed for M. Fabian at Mercers Chappel in Cheapſide, and
ſold by A. Baldwin in Warwicklane. 1701.

Orthodox Trinitarian

OF A N

Explanation and Assertion of the

DOCTRINE

OF THE

Holy Trinity & Unity

According to Scripture



Late ACT OF PARLIAMENT

By a voice of Truth and Peace

L O N D O N

Printed for M. Baldwin at Mercer's Chapel in Chancery, and
Sold by M. Baldwin in Warwick Lane. 1792.

T H E
Orthodox Trinitarian, &c.

THE Controversy about the Holy Trinity, I think has been managed with more Heat than Light, and with more Passion than Christian Patience: And notwithstanding all that has been done by those who have engag'd in this Contest, great part of the People, who either want capacity, or opportunity for close application of mind, still remain uncertain and doubtful in this Article, so necessary rightly to be believed. But tho I can neither admire the good conduct, nor see the great success of our Divines in their Polemical Efforts in this matter, I cannot but applaud, and be highly satisfied with the wise determination, and judicious decision of our Parliament, in their late Act for the more effectual suppressing of Blasphemy and Profaneness. Who being our English General Council, most reasonably constituted, both of Laity and Clergy, have not more authentickly than equitably, determin'd the Point between the contending Parties; and by their Authority assign'd the Penalties they are now both equally liable to incur by their Extravagancies in opposing the true sense and meaning of this Act; which I think none wittingly can do without making it a Contradiction, or at least an Inforcement of total Silence in this matter. But whereas our Statutes are Discourses wherewith the people do but little acquaint themselves, or always understand, I shall recite the words of the Act, so far as is necessary to my present purpose, and then endeavour to explain and vindicate the Doctrine therein establish'd relating to the Holy Trinity; hoping this Law, when understood, may be thenceforth no more a Terror to any of those who have on either side been good and honest Contenders, but a Monument of their happy Reconciliation and Agreement.

The A C T.

Be it enacted, &c. That if any Person having been educated in, or made profession of the Christian Religion within this Realm, shall, by writing, printing, preaching, teaching, or advised speaking, deny, 1st. Any one of the Persons in the Holy Trinity to be God : Or, 2^{ly}. shall assert, or maintain there are more Gods than one : Or, 3^{ly}. shall deny the Christian Religion to be true : Or, 4^{ly}. the Holy Scripture of the Old and New Testament, to be of Divine Authority : and shall upon Indictment, or Information, &c. be thereof lawfully convicted, he shall for the first Fault, &c.

Now in order to the Explication and Assertion of the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, and of the Unity of God : that neither of the Persons may be denied to be God, and yet that there may be no more Gods asserted than One : that the blind, zealous, and mistaken Trinitarian, may not anathematize me as a *Socinian* Heretick ; nor the Reason-boasting, and Sceptical Unitarian, find me either a downright, or yet a consequential Tritheist, or but a nominal Christian ; I will engage my self to the three following Postulates, which I foresee my intelligent Reader may count but necessary, and reasonable ; and I confess may not unjustly demand of me, who pretend to do something more than has been done in this Controversy.

1. That I shall lay down no Proposition, or Assertion, but what my Reader may take in some certain and obvious sense, and whereby he may understand the same thing that I my self mean : That I tell my Reader plainly what I intend by any word that might be otherwise doubtful and uncertain. That I will not do as is too commonly done in the most serious and weighty Matters, use, or rather abuse words without any determinate Sense : As if while I contend that there is a Holy Trinity of Three Persons, when it shall be demanded of me what I mean by *Persons*, I cannot tell, or which is the same thing, answer, Three Somewhats, or give some unintelligible definition of the Word, which will amount to but an *ignotum per ignotius*.

2. That

2. That I shall assert nothing but what I see possible to be true, and what any ordinary Reader, by due application, may see to be so: That I will affirm nothing that implicates, puzzles, contradicts, or destroys it self, or that is contrary to any *Self-evident*, or *Identical Proposition*; as that a thing is so and so, and not so and so at the same time; that the Part is as much as the Whole, &c. or any thing that infers the like, or any thing that is contrary, or disagreeable to evident Reason, and Demonstration.

3. That I shall maintain nothing but what is according to the *obvious, plain, and agreeing Sense* of Scripture; because the Scripture is the *ground* of our Faith in this Matter, allowed by both sides of the sober Contenders in this Point: which as it is necessary rightly to be believed by all Christians, must needs be a Doctrine, the truth of which may be seen evident, and plain to the meanest considerer, that without prejudice seeks information from the *Bible it self*; and not such a Point as requires the nicest Speculation and Subtilty to the right understanding thereof, or is most easily believed by those that least consider it.

Now as the *Scripture-sense* of the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, and Unity, when found, must be allowed by all that own the sacred Book; so we must needs suppose the same to be the sense of the Parliament: Because one of the four Articles in the Act, the denial whereof equally incurs the same Penalties, is *the Divine Authority of the Scripture*. But that we may find what is the *Scripture-sense* of these two Articles of the Holy Trinity, and Unity, it may not unprofitably be first consider'd what *cannot be* the sense thereof. And it must be confess'd that, That which we see, or can conclude by *Good Reason to be false*, can never be true by *Revelation*.

The Divine Author of the Holy Scripture, as he cannot be suppos'd to enjoin us the *mere repeating, or asserting* of any Proposition, when we have no understanding, or determinate sense of the *Words*; so neither can he be thought to give us as a Revelation that which is contradictory or disagreeing to any *self-evident Notion*, or that which is not reasonable: I say, he can't be thought to oblige us to assert such things, which no way become Divine Wisdom, and Goodness, and are no way profitable to his Creatures. I don't say, he can't command us the *belief* of the like Proposition, because I am apt to think it will appear that *such Propositions*, tho never so frequently repeated, or zealously affirm'd, are not, nor can indeed be *believed*; if we but consider that Faith is an assent to a Proposition

position as a *Truth* on some Testimony. Now if we do not know certainly what the *Proposition* is (as it is impossible we should if we do not understand the true sense of the Words) tho we may be well perswaded that the *Speaker speaks Truth*, from sufficient Arguments of his Veracity, it is evident we do not believe, or at least 'tis but by chance, and we know not that we believe the Proposition. And if Propositions be *contradictory*, or *inconsistent with any others we know to be true*, it is as certain we do not believe, or assent to them as *Truths*, or credit the Testimony: For if we see them repugnant, and contradictory, and yet assert them, we lie, and do not believe; and if we do not see them so, it is because we don't understand the sense of the Words; and so, as I said, can have no *Faith* of the Proposition, or at least do not know whether we have or no; and so at best say we care not what, by professing that we believe it.

Moreover, because I foresee I shall not be able to satisfy some, even sober Criticks, in urging on their belief any Proposition with a *Pretence* (as they will call it) of being above, yet not contrary to our Understanding, or Reason; I shall endeavour, in as few words as I can, to examine, and clear this matter: *Whether or no, or how, we can be said to believe a Proposition, that is above our Understanding, or Reason.* And hereby I hope it will appear that I do not so much as endeavour to impose any thing upon my Reader; or use any Artifice to perswade *That* which I cannot do by good Argument.

In the first place, it is to be observ'd, as I but now said, that as we cannot truly say we *believe*, or *disbelieve* this or that Proposition, if we do not understand the sense of the Words; so it is necessary, that their meanings be not *unknown*, *ambiguous*, or *doubtful* to us, that we may be able to say, the Proposition is *according to*, *above*, or *contrary to* our Understanding, or Reason. For Example, if a Papist should tell me *That upon the pronouncing the Words of consecration, as they call them, the Bread in the Eucharist is transubstantiated into the Body of Christ*; unless I know what Transubstantiation, and the Body of Christ means, I cannot tell whether the Proposition be *according to*, *above*, or *contrary to* my Understanding, or Reason.

And, 2ly. that a Proposition contrary to our Understanding, or Reason, is that which we either *know* or *perceive* to be false; or that which we can *conclude* by a regular Argument to be untrue. For Example: If one affirms to me *that I don't think, or see; or that*

that the Part is as great as the Whole; or, that two and one makes four; he tells me things contrary to my Understanding, and I know, and perceive what he says to be false. So if I should hear it said, *That God is self-sufficient, and yet necessarily a Creator*, I'm sure one of these Propositions is contrary to my Reason; which thus appears: where Two Propositions destroy, or contradict one another, one of them must be false.

But these Two Propositions, that God is self-sufficient, and that he is necessarily a Creator, destroy, and contradict one another.

Therefore one of them is false.

But a Proposition may be said to be above our Reason :

First, when we can neither demonstrate it, nor doubt of it; being known by a *higher, or nearer, or clearer Light*, than that which can be concluded, or inferr'd by Argumentation: such are things experienced, self-evident, and identical Propositions, and first Principles: As, that I have pleasure in finding Truth: That Two and One are Three: God is God: God is not that which is not God: God is the self-sufficient, and necessary Being, &c. But such Propositions, tho they may be said to be above Reason, are not above our Understanding, but the most near, and adequate Objects thereof.

But 2^{ly}, I think a Proposition is most properly said to be above, or out of the reach of our Understanding, or Reason, when we neither know it, nor see any Reason to conclude it, to be either True, or False; or when we see no more probability on the one side than on the other. But whether such a Proposition is to be believed, presently appears an idle Question, for it must needs be useless, leaving the Mind perfectly indifferent; and tho we may possibly be enclined to assert, or deny it, it is from some other prevailing Bias in our Wills, and not from the Nature of the thing. But if such a Proposition shall be determined by one whose Faithfulness, and Knowledge we are assured of, to be either True or False; if he either makes us understand it to be True, or Himself to know it, and to be faithful, then it ceases to be above our Understanding, or Reason; for we either know it, or have Reason to believe it, or disbelieve it, it is revealed to us, whether true or no; and whatever we have revealed to us, we either know, or have good Reason to believe to be what the Revelation determines it: and consequently what we have no Reason to believe, or do not see to be so, cannot at the same time be said to be revealed to us. There are innumerable Truths, doubtless,

doubtless, that we neither know, nor can find out by Argumentation, or by any Activity of our Minds, we having now no means of information concerning them, or premises from whence we can conclude them: how far our Knowledg, or Reason may be enlarged, and extended, we are, and perhaps shall always be ignorant. It is commonly said we are bound to believe divers Propositions which are above our Reason, or Understanding: whether or no all that talk so, know what they say, I will not question; but I think it cannot be said we are bound to believe a Proposition above our Reason in the first sense, *viz.* that which is known, or self-evident; because the Knowledg, and Faith of the same Proposition are inconsistent: but yet we may be well oblig'd to *confess*, and *profess* such things. Nor can it be said we are bound to believe a Proposition above our *Understanding*, or *Reason*, in the second sense, *viz.* when we don't know, or cannot conclude it to be either *True*, or *False*: Because as it is impossible to know, or believe it both true, and false, so we have nothing to determine us which to believe. If by a Proposition's being above our *Understanding*, or *Reason*, be meant neither of these ways, I confess I know not, nor could ever learn what we are to mean, which renders *me* at least incapable of such a Faith. But if a Proposition of *this sort* be revealed to us, by one that is Trusty, and knows it to be *true*, then it becomes the proper matter of Faith: But I cannot deny that I am apt to think it may be said, that most of those Propositions that are said to be only *above*, not *contrary* to, our *Reason*, or *Understanding*, and yet do demand our Faith, are indeed such as we have (or may have) reason to conclude either *true*, or *false*, if not *Knowledg* that they are so. And that I may go to the bottom of this matter if possible, and leave nothing for the critical Reader, tho even a Socinian, to blame me for, or that may hinder his belief of the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity; I shall a little further examine this matter in some of the most common Instances of things that are said to be above, but not contrary to our *Understanding*, or *Reason*.

I might begin with the famous Doctrine of Transubstantiation, a Point as *great* for the exercising the resignation of our *Reason* and *Understanding* as can be wished. But all Protestants having here surmounted the suppos'd difficulty of opposing carnal Reason, yea and Sense, to a plain Text of Scripture, I shall omit it. Nor shall I much more than mention the Opinion of the *Anthropomorphites*, a People not wanting among us, who have so great a number (as they believe)

lieve) of plain Texts, especially in the Old Testament, representing God with bodily Parts, and Passions, as Eyes, Ears, Nose, Mouth, Hands, Feet, Bowels, Anger, Grief, Repentance, &c. when the generality of Christians, yea Jews, that are a little intelligent, and considerate, agree that it is a sufficient answer to the literal sense of those Texts, *That God is a perfect Being, and whatever implies an imperfection, cannot be properly true of him.* Whatever has Parts, has a Whole; and of whatsoever it may be said, here is such a Quantity, so or so extended, and that is all, that Being is consequently bounded, and may be suppos'd more or less, of this Figure, or that; which things cannot agree to an infinite and unchangeable Being: and whosoever hath Passions, and can repent, or change his Mind, is weak, and ignorant, which can't be said of the Almighty, Alwise, God; so much has *good Reason* overcome those Idea's which these few Believers of the bare Letter call *Revelation*, and the *plain Word of God*. And tho these Men may think they eminently deserve the name of *Believers*, nothing being too hard for their Faith, insomuch as some of them would believe (as they say) God were mortal, or no God, if they could find such an Expression in the Bible, and have no greater Argument for the being of a God than from that Book; yet I am confident few considerate Persons but will venture the scandal of Unbelief, rather than give away their Reason in examining the Sense of its Texts. But our misery is, that few will allow that Reason ought always to be us'd in judging of the Sense of Texts; or have our Teachers well inform'd us how to determine where it must be us'd, and where not? unless, as some of them seem to insinuate, the prevailing Opinion at all times, and in all places, ought to be the Standard.

The Resurrection of the Dead, say some, is above our Reason or Understanding, but not contrary to them: That we are bound to believe it, tho we do not know the *quomodo*, viz. the *manner*, or *how* it shall be; yet the *quod*, *that it shall be*, is told us by our Saviour, and his Apostles; who being inspir'd, could not deceive us. To this I say, that this Proposition, *The Dead shall be raised*, is neither contrary to, nor above our Reason, for we have very good reason to believe it. Christ has not only plainly told us, *That the Dead shall be raised*, but left us an Instance of it in himself, sufficiently proved as to Matter of Fact. Besides, there is not the least seeming contradiction in it: The rejoining the separated Parts of a curious Machine, the recollecting of the Parts and Form of any

piece of Metal after all the separations and commissions with other Bodies that even *Fire* can make, and the like, are demonstrable by the skill of Man; how much more easily may we suppose the Author of Nature can refit together the requisite parts of a humane Body? and how necessary and futable this will be in order to the manifestation of the Truths, Orders, and Ends of things relating to the *material World*, for which Man's Body seems to be given, who that a little considers may not easily perceive, as also that they are not yet seen or accomplished? But if any one shall require us to believe, *That the very same numerical Parts of Matter of every Man's Body, such as it was when he died, shall be again united, tho the same numerical Particles have belonged to divers Men at different times.*

We answer, We cannot at all make it an Article of our Faith: and as the *Quomodo*, or manner how, being unknown, or above our Reason, is no Argument that we should believe the *quod*, or *that it is*, in any case; so neither here can the *quomodo's* being above, or contrary to our Reason, or Understanding, do any thing towards our just compliance with the *quod*, or *that it is so*, when the *quod* it self is not proved, but is easily seen to be a contradiction, or impossible. A Particle of Matter that belong'd, suppose, to three Men at three different times, cannot be suppos'd to belong to them all at the same time, not being capable of being in more places than one at a time [and such Particles no doubt there are] and such a Faith (or rather Opinion) that it will be so at the general Resurrection, no where seems to be taught in Scripture; and if it did, Reason would oblige us to understand the Terms wherein it was deliver'd in a possible or uncontradictory Sense: unless it can be made appear that it is essential to a Christian, to believe he knows not what, or, which is the same, not to know what he believes. But you may say, Tho such a contradictory Notion of the Resurrection be not taught, or is not to be asserted, yet the manner of the Resurrection, however the thing be understood, is above our Reason and Understanding, we cannot demonstrate, and do not understand *how* it shall be. I answer, As we don't *understand*, and can't *prove* how it shall be, we do not *assert*, or *believe* how it shall be; it is not revealed to us; if it were, we might understand, or believe the manner thereof. But I think it must be confess'd by those that well consider, That divers Propositions have been urged as *Revelations*, to be admitted as *Points of Faith*, the *how* or *manner* of the *Thing* being said to be above *Reason*, when the *how* belongs to the Proposition it self,

self, and is *how* it can be *true*, or affirmed, not to the manner of the supposed Truth thereof. So that in plain English we should say, *How can the Proposition be true?* we do not understand, or see cause to conclude it so; and not, *how*, or after what manner it is *true*, when its Truth is but suppos'd.

Again, how God could create the World, or how he can fore-know the free Actions of Men (say some) is above our Understanding, or Reason; yet we believe he did create it, and does foreknow Mens Actions. I answer, *That God did create, and does foreknow*, are not Propositions above our Understanding, and Reason; or how they can be True, a question hard to be answer'd, for we are compell'd by cogent Arguments to conclude the Truth of *the one*, by the Sense we have of the being of things that cannot be supposed to be Self-sufficient and Eternal. *The other* by matters of Fact in Prophecies, and their fulfilment. How or after what manner God does these things, is not a Proposition, or a Question much different from this, *How can God be God*, which I suppose no Believers will say they cannot understand. It is said again, People need not be so obstinate in not believing things above their Reason, or Understanding, for there are Mysteries in Nature, which we don't know, almost in every thing; we don't know how our Souls and Bodies are united, no nor how the parts of Matter hang together. I answer, Whatever in these things are Mysteries to us, or things of which we have no revelation or knowledg, we don't believe, and so cannot honestly assert: that our Souls and Bodies have some sort of Union we know, and that the parts of Matter hang together we see; but if we do not conceive how they may be united, I am sure we do not well believe, much less affirm how they are united; tho' for my part I do not see much difficulty in giving an intelligible and satisfactory Account of the manner of both. But however, a thing being inconceivable to us, or unknown, is no reason why we should assert it, or any thing else that is so. But I shall pass these things as previous Observations, and Rules to oblige myself to such plainness, that the nicest Critick may have no pretence of Reason to disbelieve the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, when so plainly explicated, and asserted without any thing that Unbelievers have been apt to object. I shall now proceed to the matter it self, which I shall treat of under these Heads.

1. That there is a Trinity, and that of *Real Persons*, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

2. That there is but one supreme, self-sufficient Being, or God.
3. How the Persons in the Holy Trinity, being each of them God, is consistent, or inconsistent with the Unity of the supreme self-sufficient Being.

In order to which it is first necessary that I give the Definition of the word *Person*, and that such a one as is agreeable with the things said of the Persons of the Holy Trinity in Scripture, and what is not dissonant to the general Notion of Mankind; for inasmuch as the Scripture was written for the information of all Men, in things necessary to Salvation (as all Protestants rightly hold) it must needs be suppos'd intelligible to men of ordinary Capacities, so far as it directs what is indispensably necessary for them to believe and do: and this Point of the Holy Trinity being a fundamental Article of Christian Religion, cannot be suppos'd a Doctrine so abstruse, as not easily to be apprehended, or express'd, but by men of subtilty, and great application, muchless such as even our greatest Divines cannot agree in the Notion of: nor can it be thought the Persons should be Persons but in an uncommon, uncertain, or unknown sense; nor can we perceive that such an implicit Doctrine could have any evident and certain good use to a Christian Life and Practice, the end of all Christian Faith. But the agreed general Notion of a *Person* (and such as I shall endeavour to prove the Persons in the Holy Trinity to be represented in Scripture) is this.

A Person is an individual intelligent Substance, or individual thinking Being; that is, a distinct Soul or Mind.

This is generally agreed upon by those that know how to give Definitions, tho they all will acknowledg, as we do, that there are divers sorts of Persons, as an Infinite Person, and a Finite; an unbodied, and a bodied; a sinless, and a sinful Person, &c. And even the common People, tho they do not readily define, yet mean the same thing. Ask any ordinary Capacity (as I did for a trial) how many Persons are spoken of in this Text, *Luke 1. 26, 27. God sent the Angel Gabriel to a City of Galilee named Nazareth, unto a Virgin whose Name was Mary, espoused to a Husband whose Name was Joseph: And they will readily tell you Four; God, the Angel Gabriel, the Virgin Mary, and Joseph.* That we read of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost in Scripture, all are agreed; and that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, are Three, or a Trinity in some sense or other, I think no Christian will deny. But that the
Three

Three Persons in the Holy Trinity are *Three real Persons*; that is, *Three individual intelligent Beings*, or *Minds*, I shall endeavour to make apparent against all Socinians, or Nominal Trinitarians, who agree in denying the plain Scripture, and establish'd Notion of the Persons in the Holy Trinity; to which purpose I lay down this Argument.

Whomsoever both Scripture, and thence Reason, always represent and speak of as distinct, individual, intelligent Substances, thinking Beings, or Minds, that is, real Persons, giving them distinct personal Properties, are so: But both Scripture, and thence Reason, always represent and speak of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, as three distinct, individual, intelligent Substances, thinking Beings, or Minds, that is, real Persons, giving them distinct personal Properties.

Therefore the Father, the Son, and Holy Ghost are so, viz. real Persons.

The Major I think can't be denied, the Minor will appear as to the part of Reason from the universal Sense of Mankind, who will readily agree, that according to Reason, a Father, his Son, and a Spirit, a Third, who is neither the Father, nor his Son; a Father intelligent, a Son intelligent, and a Spirit intelligent, are three Persons in the foresaid Sense: the Father is not the Son, the Son is not the Father, the Spirit is neither the Father nor the Son; therefore the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, are three real Persons. But methinks I hear some reply, We confess a Father, his Son, and a Third that is neither the Father, nor Son, each intelligent among Creatures, and comprehensible Beings, must be Three real Persons indeed, or distinct intelligent Beings, we clearly see; but in the incomprehensible Being, there may be a Father, his Son, and a Third, the Spirit, that is neither the Father, nor Son, and yet but one intelligent Substance, Being, or Mind; or that the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, are not Three real Persons, but one and the same intelligent Substance, or Being, in God; or but Modes or Properties of the one self-sufficient incomprehensible Mind. I answer, first, by a Query, How can *one* tell this can be, more than *another* that it can't be? But I further affirm, That he that asserts that a Father, a Son, and a Spirit that is neither Father nor Son, may be but one intelligent Being, or Mind, in the incomprehensible Being; or but Modes, Properties, or Attributes, &c. of the incomprehensible Being, is not at all before-hand with him, who saith, it can't

be so. Both confess that this would be absurd, if said of the Beings that are comprehensible; and to affirm it is, or may be so in the incomprehensible, is to affirm the incomprehensible so far comprehensible. And one would think Christian Modesty should forbid to affirm, as well as to deny that which is said to be incomprehensible, whilst one takes it so to be. But he that refuses to affirm that which to him is incomprehensible, is certainly more modest and discreet than he who not only affirms, but urges others to affirm it. But it will be rejoyn'd, That tho Reason can't discover either that this is, or may be so, or that it is not, or can't be so; yea tho Reason be granted to conclude that it cannot be so, yet Revelation assures us that it is so. I answer, Revelation may assure us of the Truth of a Proposition that Reason alone could not; but if good Reason concludes a Proposition is not true, I don't see how Revelation can be suppos'd to assure us it is. But I say, Reason taking Revelation to its help (not to its confusion) can see no such thing, but thereby is enabled to conclude that is not true which is said against the reality of the Three Persons in the Trinity. And so let us come to Revelation, where is the sufficient trial of this matter; which, to prove my Minor, is found to speak of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as three *real Persons*, but does no where say that they are but one real, or three nominal or improper Persons, which appears sufficiently in the following Texts.

Mark 14. 36. *And he said, Abba, Father, All things are possible unto thee, take away this Cup from me: nevertheless not what I will, but what thou wilt.* So, Mat. 26. 39. so Luke 22. 42. *Father, if thou wilt, let this Cup pass from me; but not my Will but thine be done.* John 3. 35. *The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand.* John 5. 21, 22. *For as the Father raiseth the dead, and quickneth; so also the Son quickneth whom he will. For the Father judgeth none, but hath given all Judgment to the Son, &c.* V. 26. *For as the Father hath Life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have Life in himself.* V. 27. *And hath given him authority to execute Judgment also, because he is the Son of Man.* V. 30. *I can of my self do nothing; as I hear, I judg, and my Judgment is just; because I seek not my own Will, but the Will of the Father who hath sent me.* V. 31. *If I bear witness of my self, my Witness is not true, &c.* But I have a greater Witness than that of John; for the Works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same Works bear witness of me that the Father hath sent me. V. 37. *And the Father himself, who hath sent me, hath born witness*

ness of me. Ye have neither heard his Voice at any time, nor seen his Shape. John 6. 37. All that the Father giveth me, shall come unto me; and him that cometh to me, I will in no wise cast out. V. 38. For I came down from Heaven, not to do my own Will, but the Will of him that sent me. V. 39. And this is the Father's Will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me, I should lose nothing, &c. V. 57. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father; so, &c. John 8. 16. If I judg, my Judgment is true; for I am not alone, but I and the Father that sent me. V. 18. I am one that bear witness of my self, and the Father that sent me, beareth witness of me. V. 29. And he that sent me, is with me; the Father hath not left me alone: for I do always those things that please him. V. 42. For I proceeded forth, and came from God: neither came I of my self, but he sent me. V. 49. I honour my Father. V. 50. I seek not mine own Glory, &c. V. 54. If I honour my self, my Honour is nothing: it is my Father that honoureth me, of whom ye say, that he is your God. John 11. 41. Jesus lift up his eyes, and said, Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me. John 12. 27. Now is my Soul troubled, and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour, &c. V. 28. Father, glorify thy Name, &c. V. 49. For I have not spoken of my self, but the Father that sent me, he gave me a Commandment what I should say, and what I should speak. V. 50. And I know that his Commandment is life Everlasting: whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak. John 13. 3. Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he was come from God, and went to God, &c. John 14. 31. That the World may know that I love the Father; and as my Father gave me commandment, even so I do. John 17. 11. And now I am no more in the World, but these are in the World, and I come to thee. Holy Father, keep through thine own Name, those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one as we are, &c. Rom. 15. 6. That ye may with one mind, and one mouth, glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. 2 Cor. 11. 31. The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is blessed for evermore, knoweth that I lie not. Ephes. 1. 17. That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of Glory, may give you the Spirit of Wisdom. Matth. 24. 36. But of that day and hour knoweth no Man, no, not the Angels of Heaven, but my Father only. So Mar. 13. 32. But of that day, and that hour, knoweth no one, no, not the Angels which are in Heaven, neither the Son, but the Father. John 10. 29. My Father which gave them me, is greater than all. Joh. 14. 28. If ye loved me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto the Father; for my Father

is greater than I. John 15. 10. If ye keep my Commandments, ye shall abide in my love, even as I have kept my Father's Commandments, and abide in his love. V. 24. But now have they both seen, and hated both me and my Father. John 20. 17. Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father : but go to my Brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father, and to my God, and your God. Mat. 3. 17. And lo a Voice from Heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. So, Cap. 17. 5. and Mark 1. 11. and Luke 3. 22. Mat. 16. 16. Peter answer'd and said, Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God. Luke 1. 32. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest. V. 35. The Power of the Highest shall overshadow thee : therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God. John 5. 19 The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do : for what things he doth, these doth the Son likewise. V. 20. For the Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him all things that himself doth : and he will shew him greater Works than these, &c. Rom. 8. 3. God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful Flesh. 1 Cor. 15. 27. But when he saith, all things are put under him, it is manifest, that He is excepted, who did put all things under him. V. 28. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then also shall the Son himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all. Heb. 1. 5. To which of the Angels saith he, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee, &c. V. 8. But unto the Son he saith, Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever, a Scepter of Righteousness is the Scepter of thy Kingdom. V. 9. Thou hast loved Righteousness, and hated Iniquity ; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the Oil of Gladness above thy Fellows. Heb. 5. 7. Who in the days of his Flesh, when he had offered up Prayers, and Supplications, with strong crying and Tears, unto him that was able to save him from Death, and was heard, &c. V. 8. Tho he were a Son, yet learned he Obedience by the things which he suffered. John 3. 16. For God so loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting Life. Acts 3. 13. The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our Fathers, hath glorified his Son Jesus, whom ye delivered up, &c. to Ver. 26. Rom. 5. 10. For if when we were Enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, &c. Rom. 8. 32. He that spareth not his own Son, but delivered him up, &c. Gal. 4. 4. When the fullness of time was come, God sent forth his Son made of a Woman, made under the Law. Heb. 1. 2. Hath in these last days spoke by his Son, &c.

1 John 4. 9. In this was manifest the love of God towards us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the World, &c. The Son saith, John 14. 16. I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever. V. 17. Even the Spirit of Truth, whom the World cannot receive; because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him, for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you. V. 26. But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my Name, he shall teach you all things, &c. Cap. 15. 26. But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me. John 16. 7. If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you, &c. V. 13. When the Spirit of Truth is come, he will guide you into all Truth: for he shall not speak of himself: but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak, and he will shew you things to come. V. 14. He shall glorify me, for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you. John 7. 39. But this spake he of the Spirit, which they who believe on him, should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified. Luke 3. 22. The Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape like a Dove upon him, &c. So, Mat. 3. 16. and Mark 1. 10. and John 1. 32. Acts 1. 5. Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost, &c. Acts 2. 3. There appeared cloven Tongues like as Fire, and it sat upon each of them; and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost. V. 33. Having received of the Father the Promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, &c. Cap. 13. 2. The Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul, &c. V. 4. So they being sent forth by the Holy Ghost, &c. Acts 15. 28. It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, &c. Cap. 16. 6. Were forbidden of the Holy Ghost to preach the Word in Asia. 2 Cor. 13. 14. The Grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Heb. 10. 13. Whereof the Holy Ghost also is a Witness to us. 1 Pet. 1. 12. With the Holy Ghost sent down from Heaven. Eph. 4. 30. Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, &c. Mat. 28. 19. Go ye therefore, and teach all Nations; baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. 1 John 5. 7. There are Three that bear record in Heaven: the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost.

These Texts are a few of many that might be recited, but I fear enough to tire my Reader: To relate all that is said concerning the Father, Son, and Spirit, in Scripture, as of distinct intelligent Substances, would be I think to read over a great part of the

Bible. But it will be objected, that in the last Text recited, viz. 1 John 5. 7. tho the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, are said to be *Three* that bear witness, yet they are said to be *One*. I answer, They are not said to be *One intelligent Substance, Being, or God*; for so they could not be three Witnesses, neither could *They* be *They*, but *They* would be *He*; and so an identical Proposition must be false, or the Text would be nonsense, which cannot be supposed. Nor does the Text say, *Hoi treis beis eisi*, These Three in the Masculine are One, but *Hoi treis ben eisi* are One in the Neuter: not *Hen Theos*, or *Hen Hypostasis*, but as appears from the context *Hen Marturion*; or rather *eis to hen*, as some Copies read, *One Testimony*, or unto One, that is, agreeing unto One Testimony; which Testimony is, that God has given us eternal Life, and this Life is in his Son, Ver. 11. But again it is said, John 10. 30. Christ saith, *the Father and I are One*: But it is also apparent here, both from the Words, and Context, that he meaneth not one intelligent Substance, or Being. It is not said *beis*, viz. *Hypostasis*, or *Ousia*, but *Hen esmen*, we are one, that is, one in what the Context relates to, viz. one in Agreement, or Will to perform the same thing. None shall pluck my Sheep out of my Hands: For my Father who gave them to me, is greater than all; and so consequently, none can pluck them out of my Father's hands; and I and my Father are one: that is, our Wills agree in preserving the Sheep. But Christ himself explains the Oneness of himself, and his Father, John 17. 11. *Holy Father, keep them in thy Name whom thou hast given me, that they may be One, as We are*. So, V. 21. *That they may be all One, as thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us, &c.* V. 22. *That they may be One, as we are One*. V. 23. *I in them, and thou in me; that they may be made perfect in One, that the World may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them as thou hast loved me*. So Gal. 3. 28. *We are all one in Christ Jesus*. So it is said of Man, and Wife; Mat. 19. 5, 6. *They twain shall be one Flesh, they are no more twain but one Flesh*. 1 Cor. 6. 17. *He that is joyned to the Lord is one Spirit*. So 1 Cor. 3. 8. *He that planteth, and he that watereth, are one*. But it is to be further consider'd, that the Supposition of the Father, Son, and Spirit, being but Three Names, Properties, Modes, manners of Working, or somewhat else of the same one intelligent Being, or Substance, and not Three real proper Persons (by which Supposition the Nominal Trinitarians give away the cause to the Socinians) would consequently make the Gospel, which we rightly count the most authentic,

thentick, and best attested History in the World, not a *Proper*, and *Real*, but only a *Nominal*, or *Parabolical History*: That the Narrative of the *Birth, Life, Preaching, Sufferings, Death, Resurrection, Ascension, &c.* of the Son of God; of God's sending him to preach the Gospel to Sinners, and raising him from the dead, when slain by the Wicked; of the Son's praying to, and worshipping the Father, the Father's leaving him for a time; the account of the Mission of the Holy Ghost, to instruct and comfort the Faithful after Christ's leaving them, by things he should not speak of himself, but hear and receive from the Father, and Son, &c. I say, that all these things should be but a Story of *Modes, Properties, Attributes, &c.* of the one self-sufficient Being, would make the Gospel but a *Romance*, or *Parable*; Were it possible to apply it so, and get off the *Absurdities* of making a being begotten, dependent, sent, dying, and being rais'd from the dead, eating and drinking, &c. *Modes, Properties, or Attributes* of the *All-perfect Being*. At this rate we might be persuaded that *Menander, Saturninus*, with their Followers, and the *Manichees* that held that Jesus Christ was no *real Man*, but a *Phantom*; or the *Sabellians*, or *Patripassians*, that said the Father suffer'd, were the only Orthodox Believers, and injuriously reputed as Hereticks. Besides, on such a Supposition of no more but a *Nominal Trinity*, or *Trinity of Nominal, not real Persons*, it would be impossible to assert each of the Persons to be God; with any better sense than one may say, *William, Henry, Nasau*, are each of them *King of England*.

But it is farther objected, by those that would puzzle the Doctrine of the *Scripture-Trinity*, That in Christ himself, if he doth consist both of a *divine* and *human Nature*, are *Two Persons*, and the Father and Spirit being *two more*, there are Four, not Three Persons, and consequently not a *Trinity*; which they have urged by this Argument: Wherever are *Two Natures*, each of which consider'd distinct, has all the *Essentials* of a Person, there are *Two Persons*: But in Christ are *Two Natures*, a *Divine* and a *Human*; each of which consider'd distinct, has all the *Essentials* of a Person: therefore in Christ are *two Persons*; urging that the Godhead consider'd alone (as it may certainly be well consider'd) is a Person (which must needs be confess'd) and that a perfect Man, as Christ was, like us in all things, Sin only excepted, *Heb. 2. 17. & 4. 15*; has apparently, singly consider'd, all the *Essentials* of a Person, and is nevertheless so for the Divine Nature's dwelling in him, while there is

always an evident personal Distinction; the Idea or Conception of the *Divine Nature* being distinct from, and not including in it the Idea or Conception of the Human Nature; and so the Human Nature not including in its Conception the Idea of the Divine, one may be consider'd without the other, and the fancy of the Human Nature being absorpt, or supt up by the Divine, is Jargon, and nonsense. I answer, It doth not follow that there is more than a Trinity, tho it be confess'd that in Christ there is a Divine and a Human Nature, or a Divine and a Human Person; or, to speak more properly, that the Divine Nature, or Divinity dwelling in Christ, is a distinct Person, and the Manhood likewise is a distinct Person, and always spoken of in Scripture as such; and that the Spirit is spoken of in like manner distinct: I say, tho we confess this, there will be but a Trinity, because it is apparent that the Father is the Divine Nature or Person that dwells in Christ, not any other Person, and Christ in whom he dwells is the Son, as may be seen by divers Texts of Scripture, as *John* 14. 10. *The Father that dwells in me, he doth the Works.* Chap. 10. 38. *That ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, &c.* But we no where find it said, that the Son dwelleth in Christ; and if it should be said so, there would be two Sons, or Christ would consist of two Sons, a Divine and a Human, and there would be two Christs, which is false: For Jesus Christ is the only begotten Son of God, or the Son of God, the beloved Son, and his Son; as appears from these Texts, *John* 1. 18. *No one hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, who is in the Bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.* Chap. 3. 16. *God so loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son, &c.* V. 18. *He that believeth not, is condemned already, because he believeth not in the Name of the only begotten Son of God.* 1 *Joh.* 4. 9. *In this was manifested the Love of God to us, that he sent his only begotten Son into the World, that we might live by him.* *Heb.* 1. 5. *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.* So *Ch.* 5. 5. *Mat.* 3. 17. *And behold, a Voice from Heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased.* *Mat.* 16. 13. *Whom do Men say, that I, the Son of Man, am? &c.* V. 15, 16. *He said unto them, Whom do you say that I am? Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.* *Luk.* 1. 32. *He shall be great, and shall be called, The Son of the most High.* V. 35. *The Power of the most High shall overshadow thee (viz. the Virgin Mary) therefore the Holy thing that shall be born of thee, shall be called, The Son of God.* *Rom.* 8. 3. *God sending his Son in the likeness of sinful Flesh, &c.* 1 *Cor.* 15. 28. *And when he hath subjected all things to him,*

him, then the Son himself shall be subject to him that has subjected them, &c. 2 Joh. 3. Grace be with you, Mercy, Peace from God the Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Father. Mar. 14. 61. Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed? V. 62. Jesus said, I am, &c. John 5. 19. The Son can do nothing of himself, &c. Acts 3. 37. Unto you first God having raised up his Son, sent him, &c. Rom. 5. 10. If when we were Enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, &c. Rom. 8. 32. He that spared not his own Son. Gal. 4. 4. God sent forth his Son, made of a Woman, made under the Law. Rev. 1. 5. And from Jesus Christ, the first begotten from the Dead.

These Texts, and many more that might be mention'd, shew that Jesus Christ is the only begotten Son, and which is the same, the Son of God; and that the same Jesus that was crucified, dead, and buried, rais'd the third Day, and taken up into Heaven, is called *The Word of God*, viz. The living manifestation, or manifestor, of God's Mind, and no Person else so eminently. See Heb. 1. 1. God who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake unto the Fathers by the Prophets, hath in these last days spoke by his Son. Luke 1. 2. Who from the beginning were eye-witnesses, and ministers of the Word. 1 John 1. 1. That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the Word of Life. John 1. 1. In the beginning was the Word. Rev. 19. 3. And his Name was called, the Word of God. Christ thus is call'd eminently the Word of God, because he was the most eminent Messenger or Preacher of the Word of God. But by the Word of God is also commonly meant the Mind of God made known, or the thing spoken; yet sometimes the very place where the Word of God was used to be given, is call'd *The Word*; as 1 Kings 6. 19. And the Oracle be prepared in the House within, to set the Ark, &c. the Hebrew is *Debir*, the Word; so in other places. So that by the Word of God is meant, either the thing made known, or the Person or Book by which it is made known, or the Place where it is made known: but the Essential, or Eternal Word of God cannot be said, but by Persons that don't know what they say; for it cannot be essential to God to manifest his Mind; if it were, it would be essential to him to have something beside himself to make it known to, and so he himself would not be sufficient, nor can his Mind be always manifested, then there must be Creatures always to manifest to, and so he alone were not Eternal; nor is the inward Word, which some talk of, any more in English, than a Word not spoken, or a Word that is not a Word. But

But having sufficiently proved, that the Holy Trinity consists of Three real proper Persons : 1. The Father of all things, even the Father of Christ Jesus ; 2. This his only begotten Son, who is also the Son of Man, viz. the Son of Mary, according to the Flesh, or what he has material ; 3. The Holy Ghost, or Comforter, he who was sent from the Father and Son, after the Son's ascension : I shall come to the next Point, to prove, That there is but one God, which one would think were needless, were it not for this surprising thing, That the Parliament of England, after so many hundred years since the destruction of Paganism in almost all the civiliz'd World, have seen a necessity of laying severe Penalties on those that shall assert that there are more Gods than one. The Notion of God, according to the sense and confession of all intelligent Persons that own one, is, That God is the Self-sufficient, necessary, absolutely perfect, highest, chiefest, first Being ; which Notion cannot agree to more than One. If one God be sufficient of himself, it follows that more than one is unnecessary ; and what is unnecessary is not God. If it could be suppos'd that there were more Gods, they would necessarily know one another, or they would not ; if they do not necessarily know one another, they are or may be ignorant of something, and so are imperfect, and so not Gods ; consequently there are not more Gods. If they necessarily know one another, then the thought of one being necessary to the other, neither would be self-sufficient, and so neither would be God. Again, ones thought of the other would either depend on the other, which can't be of a sufficient Being, or his thought of the other would depend on himself, and so he must, thinking of himself, conceive that he is not all-perfect, but that there is another as perfect, which is repugnant. Besides, highest, best, first, &c. can be said but of one, so inconsistent is the Supposition of more than one all-perfect Being.

But let us see what Scripture saith. Deut. 6. 4. *Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord, &c.* So Deut. 32. 39. *See now that I, even I am He, and there is no God with me.* 2 Kings 19. 15. *Thou art God, thou alone, &c.* 2 Chron. 6. *There is no God like thee.* And Job 9. 8. *Who alone spreadeth forth the Heavens, &c.* Isa. 44. 6. *I am the First, and the Last, and besides me there is no God.* Ver. 24. *I am the Lord that maketh all things ; that stretcheth forth the Heavens alone, that spreadeth abroad the Earth by my Self.* Cap. 45. 5. *I am the Lord, and there is none else ; there is no God besides me.* So, Ver. 14. and 21. Mat. 4. 10. *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only*

only, *μόνος*, shalt thou serve. So Luke 4. 8. Mark 12. 29. The Lord our God is one Lord. V. 32. There is one God, and there is not another besides him. John 17. 3. This is Life Eternal, that they know thee the only true God, &c. spoken by Christ to the Father. Rom. 16. 27. To the only wise God be Glory, through Jesus Christ for ever. Amen. Gal. 3. 20. But the Mediator is not of one, but God is One. Ephes. 4. 6. There is one God, and Father of all, who is above all, &c. 1 Tim. 2. 5. For there is one God, and one Mediator of God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus. 1 Tim. 1. 17. To the King Eternal, Immortal, Invisible, the only wise God, be Glory for ever and ever. Amen. Cap. 6. 15, 16. Which in his times he shall shew, who is the blessed, and only Potentate, the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords; who only hath Immortality, dwelling in the Light unapproachable, whom no Man hath seen nor can see: to whom be Honour and Power everlasting. Amen.

But I come to the third thing propos'd, viz. to shew how each of the Persons in the Holy Trinity is God; and how each of them being God is consistent, or inconsistent, with the asserted Unity of the supream Being. And this is the main Knot and Difficulty you'll say: That three Real, proper Persons should be each of them God, and yet that there is but one God, surely must be acknowledged a Mystery, and incomprehensible to finite, at least to our present Understandings: Here the How surely is above Reason, and will you pretend to explain it? I answer, Many Men are very ready, and positive in determining this and that to be above Human Reason, and unknowable, or else needless to be enquired into, from no better Reasons, but that they are lazy, and unwilling to apply their Minds to any thing that has a seeming Difficulty in its Consideration; or they have not been so happy as to hit into a good method of considering things, or want some of those attainable helps that are necessary to the understanding of them, and yet they are so proud that they can't be pleas'd to suppose others to know better than they, making themselves the Standard of Human Understanding: or else their Wills are so faulty, that they would not have such and such things made plain; it is against their Credit, or Interest, or they are afraid of dissenting from the Multitude. The Trinity and Unity, saith one, is incomprehensible. The manner of the Union of the Soul and Body, saith another, cannot be known; yea how the parts of matter hang together, is undiscoverable. The Essence, or Substance of the Soul, yea and of Body too (which some think they know most of any thing) says a third, is unknowable. I answer, Will they say we don't know this, and that? ergo, we can't

know.

know it, or no body else does or can. I believe their answer, if ingenuous, would be little better: for I hardly think they dare say they know all that can be known; and if not, I am apt to think they can judge but blindly of those things whereof they are ignorant, whether knowable or no. But that the Doctrine, I would say the Orthodox, *viz.* Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity, and Unity, is knowable, or if you will comprehensible, I hope I shall persuade them to believe, who will but grant that it is indeed a Doctrine revealed in Holy Scripture, and not a mere Contradiction. If it be not revealed, I know no good cause for any so to assert it, or urge any thing about it, unless it be naturally known; and if it be naturally known, it is known. But I suppose no one will assert that Mankind knows barely by Reason, or Experience, that there is such a Person as Jesus Christ, the Son of a Virgin, according to the Flesh, conceived, or begotten without a natural Father, by the Power of the Father Almighty, and sent by him to the sinful World, and for what; that he was crucified, dead, and buried, raised from the Dead, and taken up into Heaven, &c. If this were naturally known, there were no need of Testimony, Preaching, and Faith, in the Doctrine of the Gospel. If the Holy Ghost, his Mission, and Ministration were known by the Light of Nature, there could not have been Believers that knew not whether there were a Holy Ghost or no, *Acts* 19. 2. The Father of all things might, I confess, have been naturally known, but not as specially the Father of Christ his only begotten Son: but the very Beings of the Son, and Spirit were revealed to us, and so the Doctrine of the Trinity is not naturally known, but is *revealed*, say I, and as plainly as any other Doctrine; and there is no such Contradiction, or Difficulty in it as some pretend, if we but consider altogether what is so said of the Three Persons, and take it in a sense that we see possible to be true, and not study to confound Scripture with Scripture, and good sense, and one another with it, or out of design to impose on one another: and I think the *Socinians*, those Boasters of Reason, if they will indeed hear Reason, will have no Reason to disbelieve it, upon the account of any Unreasonableness or Mysteriousness (*viz.* since it has been revealed) in it. If it were not revealed, indeed it were above Reason, or a Mystery, and no Point of Faith; and I hope none will be so perverse as to disbelieve this Doctrine, if it be made appear to be now no Mystery, merely because it is none; or any who would not believe it, being supposed a Mystery, refuse their

their assent to the Truth of this Doctrine, when it shall appear a plain Revelation. I hope they will have no reason to stumble either at the *quod*, or the *quomodo*, the *thing* or the *manner of it*, when the Scripture evidently gives us the Notion of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, each of them God, and yet that there is but one most high self-sufficient Being, both that it is so, and also how it is so. I will not assert that every reputed Orthodox Man's Fancy about this Doctrine is true, and plain in Scripture, or that every great Man in what Church soever must needs be in the right; for their accounts of this Matter are very divers, and many opposite to one another, and incompatible, while one confidently saith, *That the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are three distinct intelligent Beings, Subsistences, or Minds, as distinct as Peter, and James, and John; and that they are the same in Nature or Kind, coequal, coeternal, &c. And that these three Minds make but one God, viz. Self-sufficient Being, because they know one anothers thoughts.* But that this fancy (tho intelligible as to the sense of it) is manifest *Tritheism*, and in the consequence of it occult *Atheism*, will soon appear if we consider, that Three omniscient Minds, tho they knew one anothers Thoughts, could not be *but One* self-sufficient Being, any more than all the Men in the World, if they knew one anothers Thoughts (as it may be supposed possible) would be but one Man. Because the Father, Son, and Spirit, would be still three *Selves*, not the Self-same; the Father's Knowledg of the Son, is not the Son's Knowledg of the Father; the Father's knowing himself, is not the Father's knowing the Son; so the Father's loving himself, is not his loving the Son; the Son's loving himself, is not his loving the Father; and so of the Spirit. Here are three distinct Selves, which is a denial of one Self-sufficient; and consequently neither of these Selves could be God in the proper sense, because each is suppos'd necessarily to know, and love something besides himself; and so the Knowledg, and Love of himself is not *sufficient*; and so each of himself is *insufficient*, and consequently neither is God.

But another as boldly and inconsiderately affirms, that the Father, Son, and Spirit, are but three *Names*, or *Properties*, or *Modes*, or *Faculties*, or *Manifestations*, or *Somewhats*, he knows not what, or perhaps *direct Knowledg*, *reflex Wisdom*, and *Love*, of the one self-sufficient Mind, as those that would seem most cunning explain it. But these Fancies I think will appear altogether as absurd as the other, if we reflect a little on what is said of the three Persons:

D

That

That he who is called the *Father Almighty*, Mark 14. 36. by the Son, saying, *Abba, Father, All things are possible unto thee, take away this Cup from me: nevertheless not what I will, but what thou wilt. Lord of Heaven and Earth*; Mat. 11. 25. as *Jesus answered and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of Heaven and Earth, &c.* so Luke 10. 21. who is said by Christ to be *greater than all*, John 10. 29. *Greater than the Son*, John 14. 28. *The Father of all things*, 1 Cor. 8. 6. *The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*, 2 Cor. 11. 31. and Eph. 1. 7. *whom the Son worshipped*, John 4. 22, 23. so John 17. should be but a *Name, Mode, or Property, &c.* of a *Mind, or direct Wisdom*, viz. that which hath something else, not it self, for its Object. That the Son of this Father, who was *born of a Virgin, by a special Act of the Father overshadowing her*, Luke 1. 32, 35. *who was with God*, John 1. 1. *made Flesh, and dwelt among Men*, Ver. 14. *was made of a Woman, made under the Law*, Gal. 4. 4. *came not of himself, but the Father sent him*, John 8. 42. Acts 3. 26. 1 John 4. 9. *preached the Gospel*, Mat. 4. 17. Luke 4. 43. *was crucified*, Acts 2. 22, 23, 36. *reconciled us to God by his Death*, Rom. 5. 10. Phil. 2. 8. Rev. 1. 18. *raised again from the Dead*, Acts 3. 15, 26. Cap. 5. 30. Cap. 13. 33, 34. Rom. 6. 4. *taken up into Heaven*, Acts 12. 9, 11, 22. *had a God, who anointed him with the Oil of Gladness above his Fellows*, Heb. 1. 9. *a Mediator of God and Men*, 1 Tim. 2. 5, &c. should be a *Mode*, and but a *Mode, Name, Attribute, or Property*; or the *reflex Wisdom, or Conscience, of a self-sufficient Mind*; and that there should be something greater, and he be something less in the sufficient Mind, John 14. 28. That this *reflex Wisdom or Son*, should be said to be *ignorant of something his Father knew*, Mat. 24. 6. Mark 13. 32. That the *Holy Ghost who descended in a bodily shape*, Mat. 3. 16. Luke 3. 22. *was sent by the Father*, John 14. 16. *and by Christ from the Father*, John 15. 16. *that could not come while Christ was on Earth*, John 16. 7. *was given*, Acts 2. 38. *was not given till Christ was glorified*, John 7. 39. *that should not speak of himself, but what he heard; that should receive of Christ*, John 16. 13, 14. *that had not been heard of by some Believers*, Acts 19. 2, &c. should be a *Mode, Property, Name, Attribute, or the Love of God to himself*: I say, how these things, and a thousand more that are said of the Persons of the Holy Trinity, should be nothing but Characters, or other Names of the *Understanding, Conscience, and Will*, or of the *direct, reflex, and self-loving thoughts of one single sufficient Mind*, I cannot at all see, when each of the three Persons are always spoken of

of in Scripture, as having his own distinct *Understanding, Conscience, and Will*: *Not my Will but thy Will*, saith the Son; *and the Son himself knows not that day*; *if it be possible, let the Cup pass*, &c. And how the Father of all things can be supposed some thing distinct from the *Wisdom, and Will* of God; or that God consider'd in himself should have as the *first, or chief* Notion of his Being, a Knowledge *direct*, distinct from *reflex*; that is, a Knowledge having something else, and not himself for its Object, I could never imagine, nor can, I think the Gospel a mere Prosopopeia, or a Fiction of the Apostles.

Now as one of these Trinities can never consist with a real Unity, so the other cannot be more than a feigned Trinity: The first cannot be held without asserting more Gods than one, and consequently no true One; so the other cannot be held, and each of the Persons said to be God: for as the Persons are suppos'd but *Names or Modes* of God, each *Name or Mode* consider'd distinctly cannot be said to be God, but all *Three*; and many more consider'd together, denote that allperfect Being, God. Nor could a Trinity be thus asserted, because the *Names, Properties, &c.* of God are more than *Three*. But if we should consider what is conceivable in God under the fewest Notions, it will come under these *Two, Understanding and Will*: For *Conscience* is not different from *Understanding* but only as to the *Object, Self, or other things*; and who that considers can suppose any *Understanding* essential to God, but the Knowledge of himself? But notwithstanding these extravagant, and unreasonable Fancies will still remain such, and the *People* generally do, and are likely to believe a Trinity of coequal Gods; for all that a few of these subtle Divines have now and then said to explain their Mystery, yet the Truth of the matter will soon appear plainly to those who can be contented to go no higher than the plain sense of Scripture rationally understood, and to admit (as I think they ought) that a Text capable of *two Senses*, a *Comprehensible* and an *Incomprehensible*, ought to be took in that which can be *comprehended*, as most becoming God to give, and profitable for Man to receive. For Instance, *My Father and I are one*, saith Christ: The same numerical one Being, say some; one in *Agreement, Will, Design, &c.* say others. Now that *I and He* should be one in number, or the *same one numerical Being*, is as incomprehensible indeed as any one can wish: But that *I and He* may be one in *Design, Will, Accord, &c.* is comprehensible and easy; yea that all Believers may

be one, so as the Father and Son are thus one, is not hard to conceive: The Father, the Word, and the Spirit, *may agree in one* (viz. Testimony) as some Copies read *Joh. 5. 7.* but have not *agree in one*, in *Ver. 8.* I say, they may agree in one Testimony, being *Three Witnesses*; but that *they* should be *Three Witnesses*, and yet here be but *One* numerical Being, is indeed very *hard* to be received except to those who like things for being *so*. But if the Scripture-sense, that is most easy and least repugnant, be always kept, we need not rack our Minds so with subtle Speculations, and divert our selves (as is too common) from the practice of plain and easy Truths; nor need we fear the censure of Men, nor penalty of the *Ast*, while we keep to Scripture, the denial of the Divine Authority of which is equally penal with Polytheism, and Socinianism: and he that puts an absurd, contradictory, or impossible sense on Scripture, manifestly discredits it, and is not far from denying its Divine Authority, since God cannot be suppos'd to be the Author of Contradictions, and Nonsense. But if we assert nothing but what is plainly the sense of Scripture, we shall neither be in danger of Tritheism, nor need we be afraid of falling into discountenanc'd Unitarianism.

X These things being premis'd, I now come to examine what is indeed the Scripture-sense of the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity; and first it is to be noted, That the Word *God* is not used in Scripture always in one sense, but sometimes is used to denote the supreme self-sufficient Being, sometimes is given to some excellent and dignified Creature, and sometimes even Idols, the Creatures of Mens foolish Fancies, are called Gods. And as no Word hath any natural Signification, but the meaning of all Words are to be taken from their use; as it is agreed upon by custom that such an Idea shall be signified by such an articulate sound, or sounds: so through the defects of Language, or the false Ideas Men have had of things, they have given the same Names to divers things. The Greek words *Theos* and *Kurios* in the Septuagint and New Testament, and the Hebrew Words *Adonai*, and *Elohim*, are frequently given not only to the Being of Beings, but to Angels, Men of Dignity, and to mere Idols: yea *Elshaddai*, and *Jehovah* (which some fancy a peculiar Name of God) and *Jehovah Tzebaoth*, the Lord of Hosts, have been given to others than the self-sufficient Being, as all know that read the Scripture in the Original. I need give but some few instances: *Psal. 8. 5.* the Son of man is said to be made a little lower

lower than the Angels, Heb. than *Elohim*; recited by the Apostle, Heb. 2. 7, 9. So, Psalm 97. 7. *Worship him all ye Gods*, Heb. *Elohim*, viz. Angels. And where we read Angels have appeared, in the old Testament, on some special Message from their Maker, they have often took other Names that most properly, and in the highest sense belong to him. As, Gen. 17. 1. *Jehovah was seen unto Abraham, and said unto him, I am Elshaddai.* and V. 3. *Abraham fell on his face, and Elohim talked with him.* So, Gen. 18. 1. *And Jehovah was seen to him at the Oaks (or Plain, as we translate) of Mamre; see the passage. V. 25. He is call'd the Judg of the whole Earth. V. 33. Jehovah went his way.* It is manifest this appearance was an appearance of three Angels in the shape of Men, whom Abraham treated as Men: The chief of which, as it seems, he talked with, and call'd *Adonai*, and *Jehovah*: Exod. 3. 2. *The Angel of Jehovah appear'd to Moses in a flame of Fire, out of the midst of a Bush, &c. V. 4. And Jehovah saw that he turned aside, &c. And Elohim call'd unto him out of the midst of the Bush. V. 6. And he said, I am Elobe (the God) of thy Father Abram, &c. And Moses hid his Face: for he was afraid to look upon Elohim. And, V. 7. Jehovah said, I have seen, &c. V. 8. And I am come down. V. 13. They shall say unto me, What is his Name? What shall I say unto them? V. 14. And Elohim said unto Moses, Ehjeh asher Ehjeh (that is, I will be what I will be) and he said, So shalt thou say to the Children of Israel, Ehjeh (viz. I will be) hath sent me unto you. V. 16. Say unto them, Jehovah Elobe (that is the Lord God) of your Fathers appeared unto me. See Acts 7. 30, &c. So Isa. 6. 1. *I saw Adonai sitting on a high Throne. V. 5. Mine Eyes have seen the King Jehovah Tzebaoth, that is, the Lord of Hosts. Gen. 11. 5. Jehovah came down. And so, Exod. 19. 20. and Deut. 5. 4. Jehovah came down on mount Sinai, Jehovah talked with you face to face, on mount Sinai, out of the midst of the Fire. Acts 7. 38. 'Tis said, the Angel spake to him (viz. Moses) in the mount Sinai, and V. 53. The Law is said to be received by the Disposition of Angels. So Heb. 2. 2. The Word (viz. the Law) is said to be spoken by Angels. Gen. 28. 13. Jehovah stood above it, viz. the Ladder. Amos 7. 7, 8. Behold Adonai stood upon a Wall, with a Plumb-Line in his Hand: and Jehovah said, Amos, what seest thou? So Cap. 9. 1. *I saw Adonai standing on the Altar. And, 1 Sam. 3. 10. Jehovah came, and stood, and call'd Samuel, &c. So, Zech. 1. 9. The Angel is called Adonai, O my Lord. So Cap. 4. 5. Now it is said God is invisible, Col. 1. 15. 1 Tim. 1. 17. None hath seen him. John 1. 8. None hath seen***

or can see. 1 Tim. 6. 16. 1 John 4. 12, 20. It is said of God, *Ye have neither heard his Voice, nor seen his shape*, John 5. 37. It is therefore manifest that these Appearances were Appearances of Angels or Messengers from *Jehovah*.

But it may be objected, that *Psal. 83. 18.* it is said of God, *That his Name alone is Jehovah*. I answer, 'Tis true, the sufficient Being is most properly, and in the highest sense, Being, as the word imports; but the Text is read in the Seventy Translation, *That they may know that thy Name is the Lord*, viz. *Jehovah*. *Thou alone art the Highest over all the Earth*; the Hebrew has it, *may know that thou, thy Name Jehovah, thou alone highest over all the Earth*, viz. thou whose Name is *Jehovah* (viz. in the highest sense) alone art highest. And yet farther, even of a Branch, or Offspring of *David*, which *Jehovah* promises to raise up to him, it is said, *Jehovah our Righteousness is his Name, which they shall call him*, Jer. 23. 5, 6. Again it may be observed, that the words *Elohim* and *Adonai*, plurals, are often used singularly; as without doubt they ought, whenever they are spoken of the Sufficient Being. But of others we have divers Instances; *Moses* is said to be made *Elohim* to *Pharaoh*, Ex. 7. 1. Christ is called *Elohim*, Ps. 45. 6. *Thy Throne, O Elohim, for ever and ever*. God the Father is called *Elohim*, V. 8. *Elohim, thy Elohim, God, thy God hath anointed thee with the Oil of Gladness above thy Fellows*. Deut. 6. 4. *Jehovah Elohim is one Jehovah*. Psal. 82. 1. *Elohim standeth in the Congregation of the Mighty; he judgeth among the Elohim*. Here it is used both singularly and plurally, viz. of God, and Judges, in one Verse. Jer. 10. 10. *Jehovah is the Elohim of Truth; he is the living Elohim, the King of Eternity*. Gen. 1. 1. *Elohim He created, &c.* So the word is spoken of one Angel, Judg. 13. 22. *We shall die, because we have seen Elohim*, viz. the Angel. The Golden Calf is call'd *Elohim*, Exod. 32. 1, 4, 23, 31. So *Dagon* is called *Elohim*, Judg. 16. 23. So *Ashtoreth*, *Chamos*, *Milcom*, are singly called *Elohim*, 1 Kings 11. 33. So the word *Adonai* is used singularly not only of God, *Give thanks to the Adone of Adonim*, Psal. 136. 3. and in other places too many to recite; but of *Abraham*, Gen. 24. 9. of *Pharaoh*, Gen. 40. 1. of *Joseph*, Gen. 42. 30.

Now as the Names of God are given to more than one, yea to many, as it is said, *There are Gods many, and Lords many*. 1 Cor. 8. 5, 6. *Tho there be that are called Gods, whether in Heaven or in Earth (as there be Gods many, and Lords many) but unto us there is one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ,*

Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him. So it is apparent that none of the Gods are Gods in the same sense as the One who is the God, and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, 2 Cor. 11. 31. & Heb. 1. 9. Father of all things, 1 Cor. 8. 6. God of our Lord Jesus Christ, Father of Glory, Eph. 1. 17. The one God, and Father of all, who is above all, Eph. 4. 6. and to whom the Son himself is subject, 1 Cor. 15. 27, 28. The God of Gods, Deut. 10. 17. Josh. 22. 22. Psal. 36. 2. I say, none is God in the same sense as He: And the plain Truth of the matter relating to the Holy Trinity is, that the first Person, the Father, is God in the proper and highest sense, and is not only *Nominally*, but *Really* the first and chief Person, the Self that is sufficient Being, the Fountain of all Being; whose Deity as it is most clearly asserted in Scripture, so I think it is not questioned by any Party, tho denied consequentially by all those that inconsiderately suppose any others every way equal with him; I say inconsiderately, for all Christians will sometimes acknowledg that the Father hath some Perfections, no other Person hath. So that when we say there is but One God, as we are justly bound to do, we mean but one self-sufficient Being, who is the Fountain, Father, or Cause of all other Beings, and eminently the God, and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is also God in a second Sense, not a false God, as some foolishly reply, but truly a God, such as the Holy Scripture declares him to be: which I think even the Socinians must confess, if they but a little consider what is said of him, and by him in Scripture. Christ is call'd the Word of God, that is the Bringer, or Messenger of the Word of God, who spake by him in the latter days, Heb. 1. 1. as he did sometimes of old by Angels, who also personating him on that account bore his Names, Luke 1. 1. 1 John 1. 1. Rev. 19. 13. The Lord Ambassador of the Father Almighty, speaking and acting in his Name, and by his Authority. Now it is said, John 1. 1. In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with the God, (viz. the Father) and the Word was a God. Whether this Beginning is the beginning of the World, as the Arians say; or the beginning of the new Creation, or Gospel dispensation, as some think from Mark 1. 1. Luke 1. 1. 1 John 1. 1. compared with John 16. 4. Acts 11. 15. Luke 1. 2. John 8. 25. Cap. 15. 27. 1 John 2. 7, 13, 14, 24. Cap. 2. 14. Cap. 3. 11. 2 John 5. 6. is not my present purpose to determine, tho I think these Scriptures may do it. But again he is called God, Heb. 1. 8, 9. Unto the Son he saith, Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever, a Scepter of Righteousness is the Scepter

Scepter of thy Kingdom: thou hast loved Righteousness, and hated Iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the Oil of gladness above thy Fellows. Here the Son, and another, viz. the Father, are both called God in the same Text: tho it must be confessed the Greek is *ho Theos*, not *O Theos*, as some have observ'd, and translate it *God is Thy Throne*, not *Thy Throne O God*: but other learned Men assert it well read as a Vocative; however there are Texts enough besides this. And V. 6. it is said, *When he bringeth the first begotten into the World again, let all the Angels of God worship him*. If the Angels are called Gods, as it is before shown in the Hebrew, and yet are to worship Christ, much more Christ may be called so, whom they are to worship: nor need any scrupulous Unitarian be offended with these Texts, that speak of Worship to be given to Christ, as Psal. 45. 11. *He is thy Lord, worship thou him*, understood of Christ, tho spoken of Solomon. So Isa. 49. 7. *Thus saith the Lord, the Redeemer of Israel, and his holy One, to him whom Man despiseth, to him whom the Nation abhorreth; to a Servant of Rulers, Kings shall see and stand up, Princes also shall worship*: Fulfilled of the Child Jesus when the wise Men came to worship him, Mat. 2. 11. and other Instances we have, Cap. 8. 2. Cap. 15. 25. & 28. 9. 17. Mar. 5. 6. Luke 24. 2. John 9. 38. and divers others. Now I say none need be scandalized at this, for the general Notion of Worship is an *Inferior's Acknowledgment of his Superior*; and according to the Degree of Superiority, so is the Worship, or Acknowledgment, which is really to be given to all our Betters, even among sinful Men; of which we have instances in Scripture. 1 Chron. 29. 20. *They worshipped the Lord, and the King*, but not both with the same Worship I hope. So, Acts 10. 25. *Cornelius fell down at Peter's feet, and worshipped him*; not with the same Worship as he worship'd God, we may well suppose: so we commonly bow down and worship the Right Worshipful such a one; still taking him for a Man: nor do I believe any wise and good Christian worships Christ the Son of God, as he worships the Father, viz. as the Original of all Being, as the begetter, sender, and giver of the only begotten Son, &c. But I shall not need to use many more Texts to prove Christ to be God, or any of those that are disputable whether spoken of him or no, of which sort there are divers; but instead of many more I might mention, I will come to his own Words on this very Occasion, where if ever it was necessary for him to speak plainly. John 10. Christ argues, Ver. 28. That his Sheep should not be lost, *because none could pluck them out of his*

his Father's hands, who is greater than all, and gave them to him. The Father's Power being engaged in their keeping, and Christ and the Father being One in their Preservation, none could pluck them out of Christ's hands. Now Christ having called the God, whom the Jews own'd as *their God, his Father*, John 8. 54. and said here also, that he and his Father were one; he did not say the Father and the Son is one numerical God, or self-sufficient Being, but *I and the Father we are one*, viz. one in working in the Gospel-Dispensation; that is, the Father does nothing but what Christ willingly agrees with, and Christ does nothing but according to the Father's Will, as he saith, *the Son can do nothing of himself, but the Father that dwelt in him did the Works*, John 15. 19, 30. Cap. 8. 28. 1 Cor. 3. 8. *He that planteth, and he that watereth, are one*. Notwithstanding Christ's acknowledgment of his whole dependance on the Father, yet the Jews took up Stones to stone him, and that as they said for Blasphemy, because he being a Man made himself God, which doubtless they did not take from his saying, he and the Father were one; [For they had then no such gross Notion as to suppose God visible in the shape of a Man like common Men; or that the Man Christ could assert himself the one numerical God, who so much acknowledged his Father as another, and one greater than he] but from his calling himself *the Son of God*, as John 19. 7. Christ answers, *is it not written in your Law, (Ps. 82. 6.) I have said, ye are Gods, Elohim; and it follows, and the Sons of the most High? If he called those Gods unto whom the Word of God came, or against whom, as some read it, or with whom the Word of God was, as profs hous may well be rendred, and the Scripture cannot be broken, that is, cannot be false, say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the World, thou blasphemest, because I said I am the Son of God? If I do not the Works of my Father, that is, if I do not the Will of my Father, in such Works as become a Son of God to do, believe me not. And if Judges, or Rulers who had the Word, or Laws of God to declare and urge to Men, or to whom the Word was sent, were therefore called Gods, and the Sons of the most High, may not I much more without Blasphemy assert my self the Son of God (he might have said a God) who am by your God and my Father sanctified, and set apart peculiarly, and sent into the World with his Word to declare his Will to Men, I my self having never had the Word of God against me, having never disobeyed him? If I do any thing of my self, of my own Will, any thing that is not the Work of such a Son and Messenger,*
E believe

believe me not that I am the Son of God. In this Text it appears so plainly that Christ is God, and in what sense he is so, that I need cite no other, He is the Lord Ambassador of the Father Almighty, and to be honoured as such: John 5. 23. *That all may honour the Son, as they honour the Father; he that honours not the Son, honours not the Father that sends him.* All must honour the Ambassador, in as much as they honour the King that sent him; he that honours not the Ambassador, contemns the King he represents, as well as he that takes him for King, or gives him honour as such, or more than is due to a Representative. As for the Holy Ghost, tho he is not so plainly called God, yet his Divinity may be asserted from divers Texts compared, as Acts 5. 3. *Why hath Satan filled thine Heart to lie to the Holy Ghost?* V. 4. *Thou hast not lied to Men, but to God.* So Acts 28. 25, 26. *Well spake the Holy Ghost by Esaias the Prophet, unto your Fathers, saying, Go unto this People, and say, Hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand, &c.* Isa. 6. 8. *And I heard the Voice of Adonai, saying, Whom shall I send? &c. and he said, Go and say unto this People, Hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand, &c.* Now it is evident, as might be seen from what I said of this Text before, that he that speaks, viz. *Adonai the Lord*, was not the Father, whose Shape was never seen, nor Voice heard; and the Apostle tells you expressly, it was the *Holy Ghost*, and consequently not the Son, by whom God spake in the last days not of old, Heb. 1. 1. So, 2 Pet. 1. 21. it is said, *Prophecy came not in the old time by the Will of Man, but holy Men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.* Now it is hence plain (not to multiply Texts) that Prophecy came of old by the Ministration of the Spirit, which God sent at sundry times, and in divers manners to the Prophets, which ceased for a long time: then God the Father in the fulness of time spake by his Son, and after his Ascension again by the Holy Ghost, the *Paraclet*, *Comforter*, or *Exhorter*, sent from the Father, and the Son speaking not of himself, but what he hears of the Father, and Son. Now on the very same account as Christ argues against the Jews, that he might very well be called God, or the Son of God; may the Holy Ghost in the *Third Order* be called God; nor can we well suppose that proper Honour is not due to any that is a Messenger of God: and tho the Angel twice out of humility refused the Worship John offered, Rev. 19. 10. and Cap. 22. 9. when he appeared in his own Person as a mere Angel; yet in Cap. 1. the Angel appearing like the Son of Man, V. 13. and personating Christ,

Christ, as sent by God the Father, he reproves him not, for falling at his Feet, which Worship offered by an inspired Apostle cannot in either place be well suppos'd the same that is due to the invisible God alone, or *John* be thought so gross an Idolater in so prostrating himself before the Angels, any more than *Abram* and *Moses* were when they bowed to the Angels (at the Plain of *Mamre* and on *Sinai*) who came as Messengers of God. But we need not rack doubtful and controverted Texts, or argue as is most commonly done from Texts ascribing some things to him, which others ascribe to the Father; I say, we need not do thus to prove the Divinity of the Holy Ghost: what is said may be sufficient, if his Divinity be asserted but in a reasonable sense, and we but consider what is meant in Scripture by the Holy Ghost.

From what has been said, I think it is plain that the Three Persons in the Holy Trinity are Divine Persons, or each of them God, not in the same, but in a rational or Scripture-sense; but yet that there is but one God, that is, in the highest, and proper sense, one self-sufficient Being, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. But if each of the Persons should be said to be God in the same sense, equally and alike so, then the Son must be said to be the God and Father of his God and Father, the sender and raiser of him that sent and raised him; the Father must be said to be a Man, as the Son is a Man, and so of the Holy Ghost: besides which Absurdities it were impossible to excuse such a saying from Tritheism, and even from Atheism, in denying any to be God sufficient, or in the highest sense, as has been shewn. But the Father is truly, or orthodoxly said to be God of himself, or self-sufficient. The Son God begotten, or originated by, and dependent on the Father; and the Holy Ghost, God sent from the Father and Son. But there is no one Text understood rationally, and without contradicting some others that make them equal; that in *Phil. 2. 6.* He thought it no robbery to be equal with God, speaks nothing less than what some urge thence against many plain Texts: For the sense of the Text, if read aright, is, he took not as a robbery an equality with God. He that was indeed in the Form or Image of God, did not take as a prey, or arrogate to himself an equality with God, viz. the Father, but on the contrary emptied himself even of that Form, appearing in the Form of a Servant, and humbled himself to death, even the servile death of Crucifixion; therefore God hath highly exalted him, &c. The Son who is Man cannot be (or think himself) equal with the Father, who is not Man; if he be God and Man, he cannot be equal with him that is

is only God: If the Son were as God, equal with the Father, and also is Man, he must be either more or less than the Father who is not God and Man; for God and Man is either something more than God alone, or else considering Man as something imperfect, God having something imperfect, less than God having no imperfection: nor is there any difficulty in this, that some of the Divine Attributes, as well as Names and Worship, are in some sense given to more than the Father; for what is said of the other Persons as to these things, must be took in that sense that is proper, and agreeing to all that is said of each of them in Scripture, which methinks is very plain in this matter. Now I am sure no intelligent and unprejudiced Reader can be mistaken in this Point, so necessary rightly to be understood, and believed, if he will but seriously read the Scripture, whence it cannot be proved in any other sense than what we have given, or be pretended to be proved in any other manner, without making the Word of God speak Contradictions and Nonsense, and without the highest Reflection on the Wisdom and Council of our Nation in making them to have laid Penalties on those that shall deny either of the terms of a Contradiction, or else that shall speak any thing about a fundamental Article of our Religion: For three distinct intelligent Beings, or Persons, cannot possibly be said each of them to be God, in the same sense, without asserting (if it be possible so to do) more Gods than one, in that very sense wherein only the Scripture, the Act, and all good Reason forbid it. Nor can the Father, his Son, and the Spirit be said to be only three Names, Modes, Properties, or the like of the One self-sufficient all-perfect Mind, with ascribing to him Imperfections, and denying each of the Persons to be God in the true Scripture-sense, and the Scripture to be true and becoming its Divine Author.

To conclude; in as much as some honest Readers, after all I have said, may possibly take me amiss, and be offended, I profess that according to the antient Faith of the Christian Church, *I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth: And in Jesus Christ his only begotten Son our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried, the third day he rose again from the dead, ascended into Heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. I believe in the Holy Ghost; I believe the Holy Catholick Church; the Communion of Saints; the forgiveness of Sins, the resurrection of the Flesh, the Life everlasting. Amen.*

F I N I S.

